



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/476,737	12/30/1999	MOHAN J. KUMAR	P8161(1070/2)	8230

8791 7590 03/02/2005

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

LANIER, BENJAMIN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/476,737

Applicant(s)

KUMAR ET AL

Examiner

Benjamin E Lanier

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,6-8,12,13,16,17,20,31 and 34-37 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,6-8,12-13,16-17,20,31,34-37 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed 12 January 2005 amends claims 1, 4, 6-8, 12-13, 20, 31, cancels claims 2-3, 5, 9-11, 14-15, 18-19, 21-30, 32-33, and adds claims 34-47. Applicant's amendments have been fully considered and are entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 12 January 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument that the prior art does not disclose a session identification assigned by the service processor that is included both in the challenge string and the challenge response to later verify the session identification from the challenge string with the session identification from the challenge response is not persuasive because Dustan discloses a database server that generates and stores a unique session identification number at the database server in response to successfully verifying that the logon input is a valid logon input. The session identification number and a portion of the logon input are transmitted to the client for storage purposes (Col. 3, lines 23-35). The user then sends a request to perform at least a first function requiring access to a first type of disparate data by communicating the session identification number, the portion of the logon input, and the first function request to the database server (Col. 3, lines 26-34). The database server then verifies that the session identification number and the portion of the logon input are valid, and exchanging information between the database server and the first type of disparate data while performing the first function which is output to the client (Col. 3, lines 35-41).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 2132

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8-10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 20, 31, 34, 36, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dustan, U.S. Patent No. 5,884,312. Referring to claims 1, 6, 8-10, 12, 13, 20, 31, 37, Dustan discloses a system for securely accessing network information wherein a user requests a logon menu from a network server using a client and receiving a logon menu at the client (Col. 3, lines 11-14), which meets the limitation of receiving a request for hardware component information at a service processor disposed in a hardware component as an open session request from a requesting client application. The user then transmits logon information and the information is then verified at a database server (Col. 3, lines 17-20). The database server then generates and stores a unique session identification number at the database server in response to successfully verifying that the logon input is a valid logon input. The session identification number and a portion of the logon input are transmitted to the client for storage purposes (Col. 3, lines 23-35), which meets the limitation of transmitting from the service processor a challenge string to the requesting client application, the challenge string including a session identification assigned by the service processor, wherein the session identification is unique to each session. The user then sends a request to perform at least a first function requiring access to a first type of disparate data by communicating the session identification number, the portion of the logon input, and the first function request to the database server (Col. 3, lines 26-

Art Unit: 2132

34), which meets the limitation of receiving at the service processor a challenge response from the requesting client application, the challenge response including the session identification. The database server then verifies that the session identification number and the portion of the logon input are valid, and exchanging information between the database server and the first type of disparate data while performing the first function which is output to the client (Col. 3, lines 35-41), which meets the limitations of comparing the challenge response to an expected response to the challenge string, wherein the comparing includes verifying the session identification received in the challenge response against the session identification transmitted in the challenge string, and transmitting the hardware component information to the requesting client application.

Referring to claims 4, 16, 34, 36, Dustan discloses that the logon information contains an incrementable value that is incremented upon a logon failure. After incrementation a decision step follows that compares the increment value to a preset threshold, which meets the limitation of a challenge string including a sequence number that increments with each new session.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 2132

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 6, 7, 17, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dustan, U.S. Patent No. 5,884,312, in view of Kaufman, U.S. Patent No. 5,666,415. Referring to claims 6, 7, 17, 35, Dustan discloses a system for securely accessing network information wherein a user requests a logon menu from a network server using a client and receiving a logon menu at the client (Col. 3, lines 11-14), which meets the limitation of receiving a request for hardware component information at a service processor disposed in a hardware component as an open session request from a requesting client application. The user then transmits logon information and the information is then verified at a database server (Col. 3, lines 17-20). The database server then generates and stores a unique session identification number at the database server in response to successfully verifying that the logon input is a valid logon input. The session identification number and a portion of the logon input is transmitted to the client for storage purposes (Col. 3, lines 23-35), which meets the limitation of transmitting from the service processor a challenge string to the requesting client application, the challenge string including a session identification assigned by the service processor, wherein the session identification is unique to each session. The user then sends a request to perform at least a first function requiring access to a first type of disparate data by communicating the session identification number, the portion of the logon input, and the first function request to the database server (Col. 3, lines 26-34), which meets the limitation of receiving at the service processor a challenge response from the requesting client application, the challenge response including the session identification. The database server then verifies that the session

Art Unit: 2132

identification number and the portion of the logon input are valid, and exchanging information between the database server and the first type of disparate data while performing the first function which is output to the client (Col. 3, lines 35-41), which meets the limitations of comparing the challenge response to an expected response to the challenge string, wherein the comparing includes verifying the session identification received in the challenge response against the session identification transmitted in the challenge string, and transmitting the hardware component information to the requesting client application. Dustan does not disclose the challenge response containing a hash. Kaufman discloses a cryptographic authentication method wherein a server stores a hashed user password in its database. When a user wants to authenticate with the server, the server sends the user a nonce, which meets the limitation of a challenge string, the user then computes a hash of the nonce and the user password and transmits the hash to the server for authentication (Col. 3, lines 1-35), which meets the limitation of receiving in the service processor a challenge response from the requesting client application, the response including a hash number that is a function of at least one of the challenge string, session identification number, sequence number and a password. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time the invention was made to hash the challenge response of Dustan in order to protect the sensitive information from eavesdropping as taught in Kaufman (Col. 2, lines 61-65).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2132


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin E Lanier whose telephone number is 571-272-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30am-5:00pm, F 7:30am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Benjamin E. Lanier


GILBERTO BARRON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100